REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated June 30, 2008. Claims 38-54 are all the claims pending in the present application. With this Response, no claims have been amended; and no new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Strange for suggesting an Examiner Interview related to the above-identified application in order to help expedite prosecution of the present application. The Applicants' representative will contact the Examiner shortly after filing this response in order to facilitate the scheduling of an Examiner Interview.

In the Office Action, claims 38, 39, 42-44, 47-49, and 52-54 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' admitted prior art (hereafter "the AAPA") in view of Dutta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,615212, hereafter "Dutta").

The Applicants assert that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

For example, claim 38 recites the following features:

"[a] storage-based broadcasting system which stores a plurality of contents to provide a service and an executable browser used for browsing the service, the system comprising:

transmission means for transmitting the plurality of contents; and

receiving means for receiving the plurality of contents from said transmission means via a transmission path, and executing the browser, wherein:

said transmitting means comprises,

first storage means for storing a service content body and a browser content body, the service content body being for providing the service, and the browser content body being generated from the browser in the same format as the service content body,

a content body pitcher for outputting the service content body and the browser content body stored in said first storage means,

content assembler means for assembling contents in the same format by adding a

10

content header for defining each of the contents to the service content body and the browser content body outputted from said content body pitcher,

multiplexer means for multiplexing the content assembled by said content assembler means, and

transmitter means for modulating the contents multiplexed by said multiplexer means and outputting the modulated contents, which contain the service content body and the browser content body, to said receiving means,

wherein said receiving means comprises,

de-multiplexing means for temporarily holding the received contents and extracting information contained in the content header of the received contents,

second storage means for storing the contents,

control means for updating the contents having been stored in said second storage means with the contents held in said de-multiplexing means when it is determined, based on the information extracted from the content header, that a content of the same kind and version as the contents held in said de-multiplexing means is not stored in said second storage means,

wherein said control means is further for selecting a content, including the browser content body, from among the contents stored in said second storage means, based on the content header contained in each of the contents being stored in said second storage means, and for executing the browser content body included in the selected content."

The features noted above in independent claim 38 are similarly recited in independent claims 43 and 48. Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., page 9, line 24-page 10, line 4; page 10, lines 19-23; page 22, lines 1-7; page 28, line 19-page 29, line 1; page 22, lines 8-12; page 29, lines 5-7; page 23, lines 6-9; and Figs. 1 and 10 as described on page 31, line 11-page 32, line 15).

In the Office Action, the Examiner first alleges that the AAPA discloses most of the features recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48. Specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner relies primarily on FIG. 24 of the AAPA. However, Fig. 24 of the AAPA discloses a transmitting apparatus 2510 that include various combinations of browser storage and a browser

11

pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher.

However, the Applicants maintain that the AAPA does not explicitly disclose at least distinguishing content including a service content body from content including a browser content body based on a content header added to each of the content; and updating the content stored in receiving side by referring to the content header, as similarly recited in claims 38, 43 and 48. Instead, as clearly illustrated in Fig. 24 of AAPA, each combination (i.e., browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher) is provided for processing and outputting either a service content or a browser content. In other words, the transmitting apparatus 2150 of the AAPA is not capable of processing and outputting the service content and the browser content together.

Therefore, the AAPA fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features of the transmitting side of the storage-based content broadcasting system of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48):

1) outputting the service content body and the browser content body;

2) assembling content in the same format by adding a content header for defining each of the content to the service content body and the browser content body outputted;

3) multiplexing the content assembled, which includes the service content body and the browser content body; and

4) modulating the content multiplexed and outputting the modulated content, which contains the service content body and the browser content body.

Additionally, the AAPA fails to disclose or suggest the following features of the receiving side of the storage-based content broadcasting system of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48):

1) updating the content having been stored with the content temporarily held when it is determined, based on the information extracted from the content header, that content of the same kind and version as the content held is not stored. In the present invention (as recited in claims 38, 43 and 48), the receiving side performs an updating of the browser in the same manner

12

as the content received prior to storing the content.

Moreover, Dutta fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in the AAPA. Dutta discloses a proxy server that is connected between a server and a client and is capable of file format conversion. The proxy server is provided for allowing the client to quickly view desired content in the server even when a file format of data requested by the client is different from a file format of data stored in the server. Specifically, where the server stores BMP images, in response to the client's request for retrieving GIF images corresponding to the BMP images, the proxy server performs following processing:

(i)   retrieves BMP images from the server and first converts the BMP images to PNG images;

(ii)   converts the PNG images to GIF images;

(iii)   while converting the PNG images to the GIF images, the proxy server transmits the PNG images to the client together with a PNG viewer (at the client, PNG images can be viewed by executing the PNG viewer program); and

(iv)   upon completion of generating GIF images, the proxy server sends GIF images to the client (see i.e., col. 7, line 56 - col. 8, line 11).

Therefore, although Dutta discloses transmitting content and a browser for viewing the content at the same time, nothing in the reference discloses or suggests the claimed features of updating both content and browser stored in the receiving side in the same manner.

Based the above discussion, no combination of AAPA and Dutta would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 38, 43 and 48. Additionally, no combination of AAPA and Dutta would result in, or otherwise render obvious, dependent claims 39, 42, 44, 47, 49 and 52-54 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

In the Office Action, claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dutta, and further in view of Schell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,735, hereafter "Schell"). The Applicants traverse the above rejections for at least the reasons noted below.

Claims 40 and 41 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 38; claims 45

13

and 46 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 43; and claims 50 and 51 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 48. As noted above, AAPA in view of Dutta fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 38, 43 and 48. Moreover, after a detailed review of Schell, the reference fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in AAPA and Dutta. Therefore, no combination of AAPA, Dutta and Schell would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

In the light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the final Office Action dated June 30, 2008, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

<div align="center">

Respectfully submitted,

</div>

Mitsuteru KATAOKA

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.09.29 16:02:36 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 29, 2008